DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 259 412 CS 504 981

AUTHOR Pearson, Judy C.; Trent, Judith S.
TITLE Successful Women in Speech Communication: A National Survey of Strategies and Skills, Contributions and Conflicts.
PUB DATE [85]
NOTE 24p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Achievement; Achievement Gains; *Communication Research; Goal Orientation; High Achievement; Higher Education; Merit Rating; National Surveys; Professors; *Profiles; *Speech Communication; *Success; *Women Faculty

ABSTRACT

A survey of 163 women associate professors and professors was conducted to determine the characteristics that have contributed to the success of women in the communication disciplines. The profile that emerged reveals the successful female college faculty member to be a person with a Ph.D, on tenure, who is not interested in being an administrator. She has published articles in a regional or national publication, attends at least one professional meeting each year, and has served on, or chaired, a committee for her professional association. According to yearly evaluations from her students, she is an effective teacher. She is self-confident, believes she has been successful in her career (in fact she places himself in the top 10 to 30%), sees herself as a leader in her department but believes that men in her profession have been more successful than women. She has been helped by a male mentor, and she, in turn, has mentored females. She does not "dress for success" and she does not use most of the behaviors associated with "women's language" in her interaction with either sex any more than she uses a predominately male communication style. (EL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED259412

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)
X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Successful Women in Speech Communication: A National Survey of Strategies and Skills, Contributions and Conflicts

Judy C. Pearson*
Associate Professor
School of Interpersonal Communication
Ohio University
Athens, Ohio 45701
614/594-5583

and

Judith S. Trent
Associate Vice President for Graduate Studies & Research and
Professor of Communication
University of Cincinnati
Cincinnati, Ohio 45221-0627
513/475-4531

Abstract

A national survey of all Speech Communication Association women who serve as Associate or Full Professors was conducted in the fall of 1983. The purpose of the survey was to determine a profile of those women who have been successful in attaining academic promotion in colleges and universities. The survey considered demographic and professional information and asked for advice they would offer to young professionals.

*The authors wish to express their appreciation to Shirley A. Williams and David Bennett for their assistance in the analysis of the data.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Judy C. Pearson

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

CS 504 981

"Successful Women in Speech Communication: A National Survey of Strategies and Skills, Contributions and Conflicts"

In recent years one of the most persistent of the recurring myths in higher education has been that since the pasage of Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, subsequent Executive Orders, and Title IX of the Educational Admendments of 1972, the status of women in higher education has improved immeasurably. In fact there are administrators (women and men alike) who refer to inequity problems for women as though they were considerations of the past--a problem now solved. Nothing, however, could be further from the truth. Recent studies and progress reports on hiring, salaries, and professional advancement have shown that equity for women in higher education is no better than it was before the legislative actions of the last two decades.[1] Although twenty-six percent of the total college/university faculty were women in 1982, in 1929-30 it was 30 percent.[2]

While the problems are familiar, the data evidencing them is startling enough to deserve repetition in every possible forum. Most of the women in higher education are in the lower academic ranks. In spite of affirmative action efforts, upward mobility remains painfully slower than it is for white males. For example, only ten percent of full professors are women, an increase of just one percent since 1972.[3] Not only are women at the lower professorial ranks, they continue to be paid less than men. A 1983 study based on salary data from more than 2,700 colleges and universities revealed that nationwide the average salary of women in the top three professorial ranks was $23,487 while the average salary of men in those same three ranks was $29,001. Moreover in each of the 50 states the aggregate average salaries of female full professors, associate professors, and assistant professors were lower than those of males in the same ranks. For those women who are promoted

beyond the assistant professor level, salary differences become even more discriminatory (male associate professors earn eight percent more than female associate professors and male full professors earn fifteen percent more).[4] Even in a study where men and women Ph.D.'s were matched by year of terminal degree and discipline, results were the same: the salary of women was significantly lower than the salary of men.[5]

The problems of women who are in administration are similar to those faced by women faculty members. A 1982 study of more than 3,000 college and university administrators found that only twenty percent were women. Moreover, the majority of the twenty percent were administrators at institutions with largely minority or female student bodies.[6] While men were employed in the larger comprehensive institutions as administrators, women typically were not.[7] When women are hired for administrative posts at research institutions they are frequently in staff or support positions.[8] Since leadership in higher education usually comes from those who have obtained the rank of full professor or have been appointed to their first administrative role at a research university, it is not surprising that the number of women in line administrative positions has not increased appreciably in recent years. The 1982-83 report of the American Association of University Professors summarized it best: After a decade of affirmative action, women, whether they are in public, private, or church related schools, have achieved very little.[9]

In spite of the problems some women have been sucessful. This study focuses on them. Specifically, the purpose of this investigation was to determine those characteristics that have contributed to the success of women in the communication disciplines. The study is important because the determination of characteristics of success may be helpful to those entering the field or beginning an academic career. One of the greatest concerns

resulting from the status of women in academia is that talented females may grow so discouraged they simply will be unwilling to continue to battle the odds. While one could not fault young women if they settle quietly into assistant professorial or lower level administrative roles and pursue their private interests rather than continuing to strive for promotion and leadership, certainly higher education would lose. For this reason a survey was sent to all women at the associate professor and professor ranks who were listed in the 1983 Directory of the Speech Communication Association. This group was selected because their academic ranks suggested that they had achieved at least one promotion. In other words, success was operationalized as achieving at least one promotion.

While we would hope that the profile developed in the study could be generalizable to all women in higher education, it may not be. In spite of somewhat universal problems on their campuses, women in the Speech Communication Association have made significent inroads into the heart of the national Association and thus into the communication disciplines--a fact that may not be true in other fields. A 1982 study of the Speech Communication Association revealed a dramatic shift in the nature of its membership. In 1967 of the 1,330 people who belonged to the Association, 366 were women; by 1981, 2,870 of the 4,967 members were women. As the percentage of female membership increased so did participation on convention programs, contributions to Association journals, and representation on, and leadership of, Association governing bodies.[10]

The literature regarding women in higher education is limited. Much of what has been published centers not on those who have been successful but on those who have not. Moreover, while there have been a few attempts to label characteristics necessary for success in higher education administration,[11]

even then, the focus has frequently centered on advice or strategies.[12] No other study has described successful academic women. Thus the questions used to profile the women in the sample were drawn from general information regarding criteria for tenure and promotion as well as studies regarding women in a variety of organizational settings. In this way we identified the following four areas useful to us from previous research: 1) Professional activities for promotion and tenure; 2) The role of mentoring; 3) Verbal and nonverbal behavior, and 4) Self-perception or self-esteem.

It is widely understood that the major functions of colleges and universities or of professors in these institutions center around teaching, research, and service that relate to the mission of the university and the professional competence and growth of the professor. A large body of literature in higher education deals with the merits of specific systems of promotion and tenure and discrimination against women in promotion and tenure proceedings. Discussions of promotion and tenure have also found their way into the literature of communication, specifically articles in the Association for Communication Administration Bulletin and have been the subject of least one ACA program.[13] In 1977, ACA developed a statement on hiring, retention and tenure in which four specific areas of professional activity were recommended by the Association for determining or defining quantitative evidence for tenure[14] and in 1978 a bibliography on tenure issues was published in the Bulletin.[15]

In consonance with established criteria, we asked respondents about teaching effectiveness, the number of books and articles published, the number of convention papers, both regional and national, presented and participation or leadership in professional associations. In addition, and consistent with dimensions of scholarly productivity in comprehensive or research institutions, we asked about the submission of external grant proposals. Had

they been effective teachers, productive scholars, and successful grant seekers who had attended and been involved in the activities of their professional associations? These are all areas necessary for promotion and tenure in most colleges and universities and we wanted to know the extent to which women in the communication disciplines had achieved their success in these traditional channels.

A second dimension important to the success of women in any organizational setting is the availability of a mentor. Much has been written about the need for a guide, a role model--a mentor from whom it is possible to learn the "ins and outs" of one's profession. While there are many ways to define mentoring, it can best be described as a validation process in which someone in a position of power assists a newcomer into becoming accepted within the social collegial network that assists with promotion, advancement, and leadership recognition.[16] While the concept of mentoring is an individual one, that is, it is frequently described differently by different people, typical functions or roles include: teacher, sponsor, exemplar, advisor, guide, friend, assistant and counselor.[17]

In spite of the fact that the notion of mentoring came primarily from business and industrial settings, it appears to be an equally established practice in the academic setting. Most women who have been successful in higher education have had at least one mentor.[18] Women who move into academic administration frequently have had two people who assist them at critical stages of their careers.[19] In one study of women who were chief administrative and chief academic officers in four-year co-educational colleges and universities in the six-state Great Lakes region, it was discovered that eight of the nine women surveyed were able to identify a significant person who had contributed to their career development. While two

categorized these "others" as role models or guides rather than mentors, six identified at least one mentor who had had a major influence upon their careers.[20] Eighty-four percent of women who were either full professors or held a major administrative position at comprehensive research universities have had a mentor or had been assisted by a sponsor.[21]

One of the most interesting variables in mentoring is the sex of the mentors. Most studies agree that mentors are generally men. While conventional wisdom might urge a female student to find a female mentor, one essay by a woman who has frequently been a mentor suggests another strategy. Gillespie argues that having a mentor is critical for success, but it may be better for the female student to have a male mentor even if there is a woman on the faculty who by virture of professorial rank, enthusiasm, and visibility in the discipline is qualified to be a sponsor.[22]

In the last decade questions of gender differences in communication behavior have been a popular focus among communication researchers. Although the last word has yet to be written on the topic, researchers have uncovered many interesting differences that appear to have little basis in biology. Women may use questions instead of strong statements in conversational situations, add qualifiers to soften or mitigate words and phrases, and lengthen orders and requests through the use of extra words more frequently than do men. Women's speech tends to be more person centered and concerned with interpersonal matters than does the speech of men.

The research on nonverbal behavior has also provided conclusions about gender differences. Women have more eye contact with those with whom they speak than do men, reveal emotions in the use of facial expressions far more than men, smile more than men regardless of emotion, sit differently, use smaller gestures, play more with their hair or with ornamentation on their clothing, touch less, take as little interpersonal space as possible, and sit

with their legs closer together than do men.[23]

Real differences occur in the verbal and nonverbal communication of women and men. Although this is an important conclusion, even more significant is the question regarding what the differences mean in terms of professional advancement. In other words, are women more successful professionally if they "speak like a woman" or are they more successful if they use a predominately male communicative style?

While there has been little published regarding the communication habits of women who have already achieved success, there have been many articles, particularly in the management literature, offering advice to those who hope for advancement. For the most part, the advice centers on adopting communication behavior typical of men--not women.[24] Women are advised that to be leaders or to achieve any success, they must imitate men--thus perpetuating the idea that leadership and success remain male dominated spheres.[25]

Although the deficit position on women's language has been a major perspective,[26] it is not the only one. One researcher has advised women to "think like a man but talk like a lady,"[27] others have argued that women's language carries no inherent liabilities,[28] and some have urged strategic or situational communicative competence, that is, code-switching.[29]

Thus an important part of this study has been to determine the verbal and nonverbal behavior of women who have already achieved some success. Have they been successful because they use communication strategies traditional to women or have they been successful because they have avoided using female communicative patterns and have imitated men?

In recent years researchers have found that women tend to undervalue their accomplishments. In studies done with college students and with retail sales personnel, women have rated their own performance less favorably than

men have rated theirs.[30] For many women, self-esteem or selfhood is frequently defined by perceived approval and acceptance from others rather than from an internal sense of self-regard.[31] Because we were interested in whether or not the women in our study have a realistic sense of their own success, respondents were asked to evaluate their accomplishments by comparing themselves with others in the field.

Procedure

A six-page questionnaire was sent to all women at the Associate Professor and Professor rank whose names and addresses were listed in the 1983 Speech Communication Directory. The survey was mailed in August of 1983 and respondents were asked to return the completed form by October 1, 1983. A follow-up letter was mailed in October and respondents were asked to reply by November 1, 1983.

Items for the questionnaire were based on earlier findings regarding promotion and tenure policies, mentoring, and gender differences in communication and self-esteem. A total of 47 items were included in the final questionnaire. Seven items were open-ended and 40 items were closed questions. Twelve questions dealt with demographic information including the academic training and background of the individuals. Eleven items considered the subjects' contributions to research and professional associations. Six questions concerned the women's pedagogical contributions. Ten items focused on their unofficial leadership and personal style--including their verbal and nonverbal characteristics. The final five questions sought generalizations about the respondent's own careers and the counsel they might provide to other women.

Three hundred and sixty-four individuals received the survey. Twenty-one questionnaires were received as undelivered returns and 31 questionnaires were from men, retired persons, deceased individuals, or from people who were in a

different career since the Directory had been published. Of the 313 potential subjects, 163 completed the questionnaire which results in a 52 percent response rate.[32]

Results

This survey sought information in five major areas (1) demographic information including the academic training and background of the individuals; (2) contributions to research and professional associations; (3) pedagogical contributions, (4) unofficial leadership and personal style--including their verbal and nonverbal characteristics and (5) generalizations about the women's own careers and suggestions they might provide to other women. The findings are presented for each of these areas.

Demographic Information

Of the 163 women who were surveyed, 138 were tenured, and 25 were not. Thirty-eight were tenured before 1970, 35 were tenured between 1971 and 1974, 34 were tenured between 1975 and 1978, and 31 were tenured between 1979 and 1983.

How many years did these women serve in the various academic ranks? Although women served from 0 to over 8 years at the assistant professor rank, the average woman served in this rank for four to five years. Similarly, women surveyed were in the rank of associate professor from 0 to more than 8 years, but the average person had served at this rank for between three and four years. We should observe that women do not necessarily serve a shorter period of time at the associate professor rank, but rather that some of the women surveyed had only recently became associate professors thus distorting this average.

Did these women hold the Ph.D. degree? One hundred and seventeen of the respondents had received this degree. The Ph.D. degrees were received in the

following years: 39 in 1970 or earlier; 27 were received between 1971 and 1974; 34 were received between 1975 and 1978; and 13 were received between 1979 and 1983.

Respondents were asked if they were faculty members or administrators. One hundred and twenty stated that they were primarily faculty members, 8 were primarily administrators, and 33 felt that they were equally involved as faculty members and administrators.

What kinds of administrative responsibilities do these women now hold or have they ever held? Forty seven have never held an administrative position. Sixty two are currently, or have been, departmental chairs; 48 have served, or currently serve, as basic course directors; 21 have been, or currently are, graduate directors; 17 have been, or currently are deans, and 35 have served or currently serve in other administrative roles.

Do these women aspire to administrative positions? Most do not: One hundred and six have no aspirations for administration. Of those who do wish to be administrators, 39 would like to be deans, 26 desire to be departmental chairs, 9 desire to be basic course directors, 8 wish to be graduate directors, and 15 aspire to other administrative roles (such as vice president of academic affairs, vice president, chancellor, or college president).

Contributions To Research and Professional Associations

Approximately two-thirds of the women surveyed have not published any books, while one third have published a text. The respondents have pulished between 0 and 6 books per individual. The subjects published 58 books as assistant professors, 54 books as associate professors, and 27 books as full professors.

Over two-thirds of the women surveyed have published in national or regional communication journals: One hundred and twelve have published articles in these professional outlets. Two hundred and sixty articles have

been published at the assistant professor level, 262 have been published at the associate professor level, and 128 have been published at the full professor level.

Well over three-fourths of the women have presented papers at national communication conferences. One hundred and twenty-six have presented such papers. More of the respondents have presented such papers at the associate professor level (76) than at the assistant or full professor level; fewer have presented such papers at the full professor level (39) than at the other two levels. The number of such papers is quite high: 330 papers were presented at the assistant professor level, 377 papers were presented at the associate professor level, and 154 papers were presented at the full professor level.

Most people have not received any research grants from agencies outside their college or university. One hundred and seven people had not; 36 had received grants from less than $10,000 and 19 had recieved grants for over $10,000.

The women in this survey attend professional meetings. Only five stated that they attended no conventions each year compared with 126 who attend one to three, and 31 who attend four or more. Slightly over half of the women have served on, or chaired a committee, been a member of the legislative council, or been an officer in their national professional association (n = 82). A few more have served on or chaired a committee, been a member of the legislative council, or been an officer in their regional professional association (n = 89). However, only 58 of the respondents have served as an editor, associate, or consulting editor for a regional or national communication journal.

Pedagogical Contributions

Most of the respondents (n = 124) stated that their department (or

college or university) require yearly student evaluations. On a scale of 1 to 5, with 1 being low and 5 being high, 2 people felt their student evaluations were generally around 1, 2 people felt their evaluations were a 2, 2 felt their evaluations were a 3, 58 felt their evaluations were a 4 and 88 felt their evaluations were a 5. Most of the respondents thus concluded that their student evaluations were quite high. Most (n = 136) indicated that teaching effectiveness, as measured by student evaluations, were a part of their departmental or institutional promotion and tenure review. Sixty-six of the respondents had received an award for effective teaching with 40 of these awards coming from their college or university, 12 from professional organizations, and 7 people receiving awards from both their college or university and a professional organization.

Unofficial Leadership and Personal Style

Most of the respondents (n = 138) perceived themseles as leaders in their departments. However, 116 of those responding stated that their colleagues rarely or never seek their advice on professional matters. Similarly, 130 of the respondents stated that colleagues outside their college or university seek their advice on professional matters.

Do successful women in the communication disciplines "dress for success?" Only one person responded that she "almost always" does; 25 usually do; 36 occasionally do; 55 rarely do; 33 never do; and 13 individuals did not respond to this item.

Women responded to long list of nonverbal and verbal behaviors with the potential answers that they used the behavior with both female and male colleagues, that they used the behavior primarily with female colleagues, that they used the behavior primarily with male colleagues, or that they used the behavior with neither female or male colleagues.

In general, the women in the survey engaged in the following nonverbal

behaviors with both female and male colleagues: approach others closely, allow others to approach you closely, interact with others side-by-side, interact with others face-to-face, initiate smiles to others, return smiles when others smile at you, tend to sit with your legs fairly closely together, use many, large gestures, cross your legs at the knees or ankles, encourage criticism of your own ideas, say "no" or refuse to requests when you desire to do so, express emotions verbally, tell jokes or humorous anecdotes, laugh at other's jokes or anecdotes, challenge the ideas of others, ask direct questions, answer direct questions, change the topic in a conversation, and pronounce the complete "ing" ending on words.

The women surveyed engage in the following nonverbal behaiors with neither female nor male colleagues: stare at others; use few, small gestures; tend to leave your hands down on the arms of a chair, or in your lap; sit with your legs apart; attempt to dominate conversation; talk for a long period of time once youhave the floor; remind others of the correct forms of English usages when they make errors; and respond with silence after the other person has asked you a question.

The women in the survey engage in the following behaviors with female, more than with male, colleagues: approach others closely; allow others to approach you closely; touch others; respond favorably to others touching you; providing others with personal information about yourself; encourage criticism of your own ideas; express emotions verbally; tell jokes or humorous anecdotes; use profanity; talk more frequently than the person to whom you are speaking; change the topic in a conversation; and interrupt the other person.

In general, the women engage in the following behaviors with male more than female colleagues: interact with others side-by-side; look away when someone is staring at you; tend to sit with your legs fairly closely together;

tend to leave your hands down on the arms of a chair or in your lap; respond with silence after the other person has interrupted you repeatedly.

About 2/3 of the respondents (n = 107) stated that they had a mentor. For 53 of the women, their mentor was a member of their department, for 28, the mentor was an associate in the communication disciplines, but outside of their university, for 25 women, their mentor was a member of their college or university; and 20 offered other classifications. For most of the respondents (n = 92) the mentor was a male. One hundred and twenty six of the women felt that they had served as a mentor. Who are the mentees of the respondents? Sixty-five respondents said they were graduate students, 79 indicated younger members of the faculty in their department, 30 identified younger members of the faculty in their college or university, 33 identified associates in the discipline outside their college or university; and 19 identified other categories. What is the gender of the mentees? The mentors in the survey identified women (n = 105) more often than men (n = 69).

Generalizations About The Women's Own Careers and Suggestions for Other Women

The respondents were to evaluate their own success in terms of the success of all females in their area or field, and to place themselves in an appropriate category. Fifty-three respondents placed themseles in the top 10%, 77 placed themselves in the top 30% to the top 10%, 23 placed themselves in the middle, one person placed herself in the bottom 30% to the bottom 10%, and two people placed themselved in the bottom 10%. The respondents were to evaluate their own success in terms of the sucess of all males in their area or field, and to place themselves in an appropriate category. Seventeen respondents placed themselves in an appropriate category. Seventeen respondents placed themselves in the top 10%, 82 placed themselved in the top 30% to the top 10%, 40 placed themselves in the middle, 7 placed themselves in

the bottom 30% to the bottom 10%, and 4 people placed themselves in the bottom 10%. Given these differences, it is not surprising that the subjects provided the following responses to the questions, "Do you believe men or women are more successful in your area or field?" Eighty-six respondents stated that men were more successful, 5 felt that women were, and 60 stated that they did not know or that women and men were about the same in successfulness.

Respondents were asked about the mistakes or errors that they believe females in their area or field made. Among the frequently appearing answers were that women settled for less favorable situations, that they did not cooperate with each other, that they underestimated their own abilities, that they concentrated on differences between men and women, that they provided too much service work and too little research, and that they were overly assertive and opinionated.

What advice would these successful women provide to young female professionals in their field? Frequently appearing answers were that women should do what is expected of a person in their position; find a mentor; publish rather than relying upon teaching or service activities; be confident, assertive, and willing to talk; become part of a female network; fight sexism strategically; and learn statistics and computer skills.

Discussion

While the results of this survey have not provided the definitive or absolute profile of the successful woman in academia, it clearly represents a beginning. We cannot generalize across fields, and assume that women in the communication disciplines are necessarily typical of, or are in situations identical to, those in other areas. Nonetheless, the results do suggest a fairly complete description or composite view of the characteristics and contributions of those who have achieved at least some success. We know, for

example, that the successful female college faculty member in communication is a Ph.D. who has received tenure, is not an administrator and does not wish to be. Although she has not published a book or had a research proposal funded by an external agency, she has published articles in a regional or national communication journal, presented papers at national communication conferences, regularly attends at least one professional meeting each year, and has served on, or chaired, a committee for her professional association. According to yearly evaluations from her students, she is a very effective teacher. She is self-confident, believes she has been successful in her career (in fact places herself in the top 10 to 30 percent of all of the women in her field), sees herself as a leader in her department but does believe that men in her profession have been more successful than women. At some point in her career, she has been helped by a mentor who was male and she, in turn, has mentored females who either have been graduate students or younger members of the faculty in her department. She does not "dress for success" and she does not use most of the behaviors associated with "women's language" in her interaction with either sex anymore than she uses a predominately male communicative style.

To some extent this profile is inconsistent with the results of other studies in that at least two important characteristics of the respondents fly in the face of traditional or expected conceptions. First, unlike much of the research that says women do not use large gestures, make direct statements, ask direct questions, criticize the ideas of others, or tell jokes or humorous anecdotes, our research indicates that successful women in communication do engage in these behaviors with both male and female colleagues. Not only, however, do these women seldom use typically female language, they are not necessarily tied to typically male strategies. For example, they do not

attempt to dominate conversations, interrupt repeatedly, or talk for long periods of time. In short, the women in this survey have clearly not allowed themselves to be categorized into one set of communication behaviors. They move from female to male strategies--if not with relative ease, at least apparently secure with the belief that communication behavior ought to be prsgmatically determined.

The second way in which the results of the survey are inconsistent with earlier studies is equally interesting. As we suggested, previous research indicates that women are less self confident than men, that they have less self-esteem. However, for women in communication, just the opposite is true. When respondents were asked to evaluate their own success in terms of success of all females in their discipline, most placed themselves in the top 10 to 30 percent. When asked to compare their success with the success of men in the field, while they believed men to be more successful, the vast majority continued to rank themselves in the top half to the top 10 percent. When asked what they believed were the mistakes females made, among the most frequently appearing answer was that talented women too frequently settle for less favorable situations than those for which they are qualified.

Perhaps most revealing was an answer to the question regarding whether they percieved themselves as leaders in their departments. Most claimed that they were leaders in their departments, even though they acknowledged in answering a later question that colleagues seldom or never seek their advice on professional matters. While this may not indicate a realistic self appraisal, it does suggest a high level of self-confidence.

In two respects our results mirror those of earlier studies. We have found that women who have been sucessful in communication have been involved in most of those categories typically necessary for promotion and tenure. In other words, success has been achieved in traditional channels. While for

most of us this finding is "old news" it does help to dispel the myth (wherever it may exist) that women have been promoted or given leadership because they are women.

Another area of similarity between respondents in this survey and other studies is in the area of mentoring. Successful women in communication, like successful women in virtually every field, have had at least one male mentor at some time in their professional careers.

While this study has served to begin a profile of successful women, we realize its limitations. There are, of course, women in communication who are not listed in the Directory. Moreover, the response rate was low, high enough to have statistical validity but low enough to be personally disappointing and to suggest that the questionnaire ought to be sent out one more time. In addition, because there are other areas important to the successful woman that were not tapped, particularly those related to personal life styles, a follow-up questionnaire could well provide a more complete view of the characteristics, strategies, skills and contributions of the successful woman. Perhaps with continued research about women not only in Communication but in a variety of disciplines, we will one day be able to talk about patterns of success and real equity in the academy.

Endnotes

[1]Betty F. Fulton, "Access for Minorities and Women to Administrative Leadership Positions: Influence of the Search Committees," Journal of the National Association for Women Deans, Administrators, & Counselors," 47 (1983), 3-7.

[2]Fulton, p.3.

[3]Fulton, p.3.

[4]Jean Evangelauf, "Women's Average Pay Trails Men's by 19 Pct. in 3 Top Professorial Ranks," The Chronicle Of Higher Education, 18 Jan. 1984, p. 20.

[5]Nancy C. Ahern and Elizabeth L. Scott, "Career Outcomes in a Matched Sample of Men and Women Ph.D's," National Research Council (Washington, D.C.: National Academy Press, 1981).

[6]Fulton, p. 3.

[7]Fulton, p. 3. See also: Madeleine F. Green and Theodore Kellogg, "Careers in Academe: Confirming the Conventional Wisdom?," Educational Record, 63 (1982), 40-43.

[8] While the frequency of women in staff positions is higher than for men across all institutions, the experience is somewhat different for women who have been American Council on Education Fellows in Academic Administration. For example, when the career paths of ACE Fellows from 1978-79 through 1982-83 were tracked it was learned that women are better represented at the vice presidential level than men and that an equal proportion of women and men hold the associate dean, department chair or division head positions. However, only 32 percent of the women who have taken administrative positions are full deans or higher while 41 percent of the men who have gone into administration are full deans or higher. In addition, women are more likely to be assistants to the president than are men (10.2% as contrasted with 3.3%). Madeleine F. Green, "Fact Sheet: Career Paths of ACE Fellows 1978-79 through 1982-83," American Council on Education Seminar, Howey-in-the-Hills, FL, 3 Oct. 1983.

[9]Ethel D. Kahn, "Women in Academe Haven't Made It Yet," The New York Times, 6 Feb. 1984, Sec. 1, p. 37, col. 1.

[10] In 1982 Siobhan Champ, an intern in the offices of the Speech Communication Association, combined statistics from SCA directories and convention programs (1977-81) with information from the National Center for Education Statistics (1964-79) to get a sense of the development of women's participation in the Speech Communication Association. The tables and overall conclusions from Champ's study were printed in the SCA Women's Caucus Newsletter, June 1984.

[11] Jacquelyn S. Crawford, Women in Middle Management (Ridgewood, NJ: Forkner Publishing Corp., 1977) and Voncile M. Smith, "Women In Administration: Identification and Recruitment," Association for Communication Administration Bulletin, 31 (1980), 24-26.

[12] See, for example: Diane Marjorie Meehan, "Workshop on Women in Academic: A Report," Association for Communication Administration Bulletin, 18 (1976), 52-53; Jacqueline J. Snyder, "Academic Administration: Opening Doors for Women," Association for Communication Administration Bulletin, 31 (1980), 21-23; and Barnetta McGhee White, "Training Women Leaders: A Model Program," Journal of the National Association for Women Deans, Administrators, & Counselors, 47 (1983), 15-19.

[13] Jon Hall, "Program On Perspectives On Tenure And Promotion," Association for Communication Administration Bulletin, 20 (1977), 14-18.

[14] "ACA Statement On Hiring, Retention And Tenure," Association for Communication Administration Bulletin, 20 (1977), 19-25.

[15]Margaret Cowperthwaite, "Tenure in Higher Education: A Selective Biography," Association for Communication Administration Bulletin, 26 (1978), 49-56.

[16] Peggy Gordon Elliott and Kristin Holmberg-Wright, "Jewel Tea And Academe,"

The Journal of the Association of Teacher Educators, 5 (1983), 67-72.

[17]Elizabeth J. McNeer, "Two Opportunities for Mentoring: A Study of Women's Career Development in Higher Education Administration," Journal of the National Association for Women Deans, Administrators, & Counselors, 47 (1983), 8-14.

[18]M. McGee, "Women College and University Presidents: Their Personal and Professional Characteristics, Career Development Patterns and Opinions about their Roles," EdD Dissertation, 1979 (Florida State University).

[19]McNeer, pp. 9-10.

[20]McNeer, p. 11.

[21]Elliott and Holmberg-Wright, "Jewel Tea And Academe," p. 69.

[22]Patti P. Gillespie, "What Every Woman Needs," Association for Communication Administration Bulletin, 42 (1982), 44-46.

[23]The dicussion of much of the research in this area can be found in sources such as: Barbara Westbrook Eakins and R. Gene Eakins, Sex Differences in Human Communication (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1978); and Judy C. Pearson Gender and Communication (Dubuque, Iowa: William C. Brown Co., 1985).

[24]See such sources as: G. Alpander and J. Gutmann, "Contents and Techniques of Management Development Programs for Women," Personnel Journal, 55 (1978), 20-25. Marguerite C. Toyne, "Woman's Career Path to Management Through Effective Communication," Journal of Business Communication, 15 (1977), 19-27.

[25]See such sources as: P.H. Brenner and J.A. Bromer, "Sex Stereotypes and Leaders' Behavior as Measured by the Agreement Scale for Leadership Behavior," Psychological Reports, 48 (1981), 960-962; N.L. Colwill, The New

Partnership: Women and Men in Organizations (Palo Alto, CA: Mayfield Publishing Co., 1982); L.M. Moore and A.U. Rickel, "Characteristics of Women in Traditional and Nontraditional Managerial Roles," Personnel Psychology, 33 (1980), 317-333; and G.N. Powell and D.A. Butterfield, "The 'Good Manager': Masculine or Androgynous?, Academy of Management Journal, 22 (1979), 395-403.

[26]Robin Lakoff has been the primary architect of the deficit position on women's language. Lakoff views traditional women's language as weak and uncertain and therefore not only unproductive but as a major element in prohibiting advancement. She urges women to change their communicative behavior by appropriating male language forms. See: Robin Lakoff, Language and Woman's Place (New York: Harper & Row, 1975).

[27]Mary Anne Fitzpatrick, "Effective Interpersonal Communication for Women of the Corporation: Think Like a Man, Talk Like a Lady," in Women in Organizations, ed. Joseph J. Pilotta (Prospect Heights, IL: Waveland Press, Inc., 1983), pp. 73-84.

[28]D. Spender, Man Made Language (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1980).

[29]This is the position of Eakins and Eakins in Sex Differences in Human Communication. See, also: F. Penalosa, Introduction to the Sociology of Language (Rowley, MA: Newbury House, 1981). And for an excellent overview of each of the major perspectives see: Fern L. Johnson, "Political And Pedagogical Implications of Attitudes Towards Women's Language," Communication Quarterly, 31 (1983), 133-138.

[30]Kay Deaux, "Internal Barriers," in Women in Organizations", pp. 11-22.

[31]Eakins and Eakins, Sex Difference in Human Communication, pp. 51-53.

[32]Nan Lin, Foundations of Social Research (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1976).